



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

OWENS-ILLINOIS, INC.
ONE MICHAEL OWENS WAY, THREE O-I PLAZA
PERRYSBURG OH 43551-2999

COPY MAILED

JUN 21 2007

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Keung : DECISION ON PETITION
Application No. 10/628,521 :
Filed: July 28, 2003 :
Atty. Dkt. No.: 17853 USA :

The above-identified application has been forwarded to the Office of Petitions for consideration of the "PETITION TO ENTER PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED AMENDMENT OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO REVIVE UNAVOIDABLY ABANDONED PATENT APPLICATION," filed March 29, 2007. This matter is being treated under 37 CFR 1.137(a) as a petition to revive an unavoidably abandoned application.

The petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a)." This is not a final agency decision.

This application became abandoned November 28, 2006 for failure to timely submit a proper reply to the Office communication mailed October 27, 2006. The Office communication set a one month period of time for reply. This decision precedes Notice of Abandonment.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply, unless previously filed; (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(l); (3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Director that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c).

The instant petition fails to satisfy requirement (3) set forth above.

Petitioner has failed to present a showing to the satisfaction of the Director that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable.

The Office may revive an abandoned application if the delay in responding to the relevant outstanding Office requirement is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been "unavoidable." See, 37 CFR 1.137(a)(3). Decisions on reviving abandoned applications have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable. Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887) (the term "unavoidable" "is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business"); In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (D.C. Cir. 1912); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (Comm'r Pat. 1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). A petition to revive an application as unavoidably abandoned cannot be granted where petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing the cause of the unavoidable delay. Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 5 USPQ2d 1130 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

Petitioner attributes the nature of the delay in timely responding to the Office communication to non-receipt of the Office communication.

In the absence of any irregularity in the mailing of an Office communication, there is a strong presumption that the Office communication was properly mailed to practitioner at the address of record. This presumption may be overcome by a showing that the Office communication was not in fact received. The showing required to establish non-receipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received. A copy of the docket record where the non-received Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement. See, MPEP 711.03(c). The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office communication may have been lost after receipt rather than a

conclusion that the Office communication was lost in the mail. See, MPEP 711.03(c).

Office records indicate the Office communication was properly mailed to the correspondence address of record at the time of mailing. Accordingly, there was no irregularity in mailing the Office communication on the part of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Petitioner asserts that the Office communication was not received by the assignee. Petitioner further references a file search undertaken by assignee. Petitioner also references a "computer system" maintained by assignee.

The petition lacks statements from anyone with firsthand knowledge of the search of the files. Moreover, no docket report from the "computer system" referenced by petitioner has been provided.

Given the lack of details concerning the docketing system maintained by assignee, the lack of supporting documentation concerning the "computer system," and the failure to submit any statements from anyone with firsthand knowledge of the docketing system, it cannot be found that the failure to timely respond to the Office communication was unavoidable.

Any renewed petition must establish that the entire period of time, from the time a reply was due until the filing of a grantable petition, was unavoidable.

ALTERNATE VENUE

Petitioner may wish to consider filing a petition stating that the delay was unintentional. Petitioner's attention is directed to 37 CFR 1.137(b) which provides for the revival of an "unintentionally" abandoned application without a showing that the delay in prosecution or in late payment of an issue fee was "unavoidable." An "unintentional" petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by the required petition fee and reply.

The filing of a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) cannot be intentionally delayed and therefore must be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the delay from the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement

that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

It is not apparent whether the person signing the petition was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances alleged therein as there is no indication that practitioner has been empowered to represent the instant application. Moreover, the correspondence address indicated in the instant petition differs from that currently of record. If practitioner desire to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate documentation must be submitted to the Office. **Please be advised that all future correspondence will be directed to the address currently of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.**

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:

Mail Stop Petition

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By facsimile:

(571) 273-8300

By hand delivery:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, **Mail Stop Petition**
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3205.



Alesia M. Brown
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions

CC: ROBERT C. COLLINS
REISING, ETHINGTON, BARNES, KISSELLE, LEARMAN, ET AL
P.O. BOX 4390
TROY, MI 48099